

REMARKS

Responsive to the requirement for restriction, applicants elect Group I, claims 1-12, drawn to a method of producing a multi-ply web, with traverse.

It is believed that the requirement cannot properly be repeated with respect to the claims as now constituted, for the following reasons:

1. Claim 26 is a method claim exactly co-extensive in scope with article claim 23 and hence indivisible therefrom.

2. By definition, the web of claim 13 cannot be produced by a method other than that of claim 26.

3. Again, by definition, the method of claim 26 cannot produce other than a web as in claim 13.

4. Therefore, there is not even one-way distinctness between claims 13 and 26, much less two-way distinctness.

5. Claims 1 and 26 are obviously indivisible *inter se*.

6. New claim 27, drawn to the web, is of identical scope to claim 1 and hence indivisible therefrom for reasons analogous to those given above in respect to claim 26.


7. Separate classification is no evidence of the propriety of a requirement for restriction. Classification is solely for the convenience of the Patent Office and the searching public, and cannot decrease an applicant's rights in any way.

Accordingly, an action on the merits of all of the claims is respectfully requested.

Please charge the fee of \$100 for the two claims of any
type added herewith, to Deposit Account No. 25-0120.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON



Robert J. Patch, Reg. No. 17,355
745 South 23rd Street
Arlington, VA 22202
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
(703) 979-4709

RJP/lk